

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The non-final office action of October 31, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 8, 11-13, 21, 24, 26, 27, 35, 38 and 40-44<sup>1</sup> remain in this application. Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 14-20, 22, 23, 25, 28-34, 36, 37 and 39 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16-19, 21-28, 30-33, and 35-44<sup>2</sup> stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,509,912 to Moran et al. ("Moran"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The action alleges that Moran discloses all the features of independent claims 1, 13 and 27. Claim 13 is a method claim, claim 27 is directed to a computer readable medium that has instructions stored thereon for performing the steps of the method recited in claim 13, and claim 1 is directed to a system which includes components, which perform the steps of claim 13. For ease of discussion, claim 13 will be compared with Moran.

To show receiving in electronic ink format a property value of a document or file on or accessible by a computer as part of a file or document save operation as recited in claim 13, the action relies on col. 21, lines 25-51 and col. 22, lines 8-23 of Moran. The action accurately indicates, as disclosed in the abstract of Moran, that domain objects are "context specific representations of information that are used in a freeform graphics system" and that domain objects are represented "by a graphic (icon) representing an instance of the domain object." The action on page 3 however equates domain objects with property values stating "Moran teaches domain objects, programmatically equivalent to the claimed property values." On the contrary, domain objects are analogous to a file or a document as opposed to a property value of a document or file. Indeed, the action acknowledges that Moran discloses that an instance of an object is represented by an icon; similarly an instance of a file or document, not the property values of the file or document, is also represented by an icon. Tellingly, at col. 6, line 24, Moran

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action Summary and paragraph no. 2 of the Office Action misidentify the pending claims as "...35-43" whereas claims "...35-44" remain pending in the present application and as identified in the Amendment filed August 21, 2006.

<sup>2</sup> It is believed that paragraph no. 5 (line 1) should state "...35-44" rather than "...35-43" as it is clear from a full review of the Office Action that claim 44 is part of the rejection (see page 8 of the Office Action).

indicates that a file can be a domain object. In sum, domain objects do not suggest nor do they constitute property values of a document or file as claimed.

As amended claim 13 incorporates the features of now canceled claim 17 calling for rendering the stored property value in electronic ink format as part of a file preview operation, wherein the property value in electronic ink format includes an electronic ink title for the document or file. To show rendering the electronic ink title for the document or file, the action points to col. 13, lines 20-29 of Moran. According to the cited section of Moran, a double tap on a document object icon causes the information displayed about a document object to expand, which results in another layout of the domain object being displayed as an overlay. Notably, there is no teaching or suggestion that the information displayed includes an electronic ink title for the document object, much less that the double tap is a file preview operation. Indeed, the information displayed is simply another layout of the domain object. As discussed above, a domain object is not a property value of a document or file. Accordingly, the cited section of Moran does not teach or suggest rendering the stored property value in electronic ink format as part of a file preview operation, wherein the property value in electronic ink format includes an electronic ink title for the document or file.

Even assuming, but not admitting, that the attributes of the domain objects in Moran are analogous to property values, the attributes are not displayed in a document object preview operation. According to col. 13, lines 30-34, to provide the attribute value structure of a document object, instead of tapping the icon, a stylus is held on the icon, which results in the attribute value structure being displayed on an overlay of the document object icon. Seemingly, upon release of the stylus, the overlay is dismissed. In any event, the display of the attribute value structure is not part of a document object preview operation. For this additional reason, Moran fails to teach or suggest the claim 13 feature of rendering the stored property value in electronic ink format as part of a file preview operation, wherein the property value in electronic ink format includes an electronic ink title for the document or file.

In view of the above, Moran does not anticipate independent claims 1, 13 and 27. Claims 8, 11 and 12, which depend from claim 1, claims 21, 24 and 26, which depend from claim 13, and claims 35, 38 and 40, which depend from claim 27, are patentably distinct from Moran for

the same reasons as their respective base claim, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

Regarding independent claim 41, the action alleges that Moran receives a property value of a document or file in electronic ink format and further “teaches that the property value is received as a command.” Based on these contentions, the action alleges that Moran shows sending a command from an application program to an operating system, wherein the command requests activation of an electronic ink entry region for changing a property value stored in electronic ink format of a document or file on the application program. Even assuming that the action’s allegations are true, receiving the property value as a command would make it illogical to activate an electronic ink entry region for changing a property value. Receipt of the property value itself would have already changed the stored property value, such that it would be unnecessary to subsequently display a user interface including the electronic ink entry region with the property value in electronic ink format, the electronic ink entry region adapted to receive electronic ink input to change the property value stored in electronic ink format of the document or file.

Moreover, to show displaying a user interface including the electronic ink entry region with the property value in electronic ink format, the electronic ink entry region adapted to receive electronic ink input to change the property value stored in electronic ink format of the document or file as recited in claim 41, the action points to col. 8, lines 24-61 and Fig. 12 of Moran. However, the cited section in col. 8 describes the steps for creating an application utilizing domain objects, and is wholly devoid of any teaching or suggestion of a user interface including an electronic ink entry region adapted to receive electronic ink input to change the property value stored in electronic ink format of the document or file. Fig. 12 is directed to the steps performed by an underlying graphics editing program when a system event or user action occurs. In Fig. 12, the system takes a series of actions based on the system event or user action. None of the actions taken by the system teach, suggest or otherwise involve displaying a user interface including the electronic ink entry region with the property value in electronic ink format, the electronic ink entry region adapted to receive electronic ink input to change the property value stored in electronic ink format of the document or file as recited in claim 41.

In view of the foregoing, claim 41 is patentably distinct from Moran. Independent claim 43 calls for features similar to claim 41 and is patentably distinguishable from Moran for substantially the same reasons as claim 41. Claims 42 and 44, which respectively depend from claims 41 and 43, are patentably distinguishable from Moran for the same reasons as their base claim, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 31, 2007

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/  
Gary D. Fedorochko  
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001  
GDF:lab